

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

In the outstanding Office Action of March 10, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0203783 (Wu et al.) Applicant traverses the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

With regard to independent claims 1, 7, and 10 of the present application, the Examiner asserted that Wu et al. teaches all of the required limitations recited therein including “enforcing an application to switch any traffic provided over internet access to the user terminal in the public wireless local area network to an encrypting security service port.” Such a feature may be performed by an access control point (ACP)/authentication, authorization, and accounting (AAA) controller. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s position. In particular, Applicant submits that Wu et al. at best teaches that an AAA network element may provide AAA services as well as providing a handoff WEP key to enable handoff of a terminal between a first and second access points, but fails to teach or suggest any application enforcement to switch any traffic over internet access to the user terminal (UT) to an encrypting security service port.

Wu et al. is directed to a system and method for enabling a wireless terminal to handoff between a first and second access point (AP). (*See, e.g.*, Abstract and paragraph [0006] of Wu et al.) As described by Wu et al., a terminal must conventionally communicate terminal authentication packets with an AAA server before it is allowed access to a WLAN through a second AP. Thus, Wu et al. teaches that a handoff WEP key is transmitted (by/through various network elements) to the second AP to authenticate the terminal to use the second AP to access the WLAN. (*See, e.g.*, paragraphs [0006]-[0012] and paragraphs [0030]-[0040] of Wu et al.) However, the teachings of Wu et al. “end” at the authentication process. That is, Wu et al. fails to teach or suggest performing any operations “after” the terminal is authenticated/authorized at the second AP.

In contrast to Wu et al., independent claims 1, 7, and 10 of the present application require that an application is enforced to switch any traffic provided over internet access to the UT (in the public WLAN) to an encrypting security service port. That is, and as described at, e.g., page 5, line 7-page 6, line 1 of the present application, “after” an ACP initiates the AAA procedure for a UT and “after” the UT is authenticated at the AAA backend system, the ACP forces applications to switch traffic to an encrypting security service port when the UT tries to access the Internet IP (i.e., any traffic provided over internet access). Therefore, various embodiments described and claimed in the present application provide security for Internet communications. (*See, e.g.,* page 6, lines 2-9 of the present application).

Applicant submits that Wu et al. fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Nowhere in Wu et al. including Figure 2 and paragraphs [0003], [0012], [0025], [0026], [0030], [0031], [0039], [0040] (which the Examiner cited to support his position) is a process of further enforcing an application to switch internet access traffic to an encrypting security service port ever mentioned. It appears that the Examiner has interpreted the feature of sending/generating the handoff WEP key as allegedly reading on such a feature. (*See, e.g.,* page 4 of the outstanding Office Action indicating that “handoff keys are used and users are transferred to different access points). However, Applicant submits that the sending of the handoff WEP key occurs “before” any Internet communications can even be requested, because again, the handoff WEP key is required to authenticate a terminal with the second AP prior to any access to any WLAN/Internet is allowed via the second AP. Hence, Applicant submits that Wu et al. cannot be interpreted as describing the enforcement an application to switch “any traffic provided over internet access... to an encrypting security service port. Additionally, Applicant submits that because Wu et al. is directed entirely to the authentication process during handoff between two APs, again, it is not possible for Wu et al. to be interpreted as teaching or contemplating any type of application enforcement related to traffic.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that Wu et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 10 of the present application.

Because Wu et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 10 of the present application, Applicant submits that each of these independent claims are patentable over Wu et al. Furthermore, because dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 are each directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claims 1, 7, and 10, Applicant submits that each of these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10 July 2009

By /G. Peter Albert, Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
P.O. Box 80278
San Diego, California 92138-0278
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268